



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

THE TRADES OF ANTIQUITY AS A FIELD OF INVESTIGATION

THE study of the industrial organization of ancient times will always be baffling and difficult, because the existing remains of the output of the industries are scattered about in many museums and are practically inaccessible at a distance from the great museum centres. Moreover, as compared with modern times, the amount of available information is small and statistical comparisons quite out of the question. Nevertheless, the field is an attractive one which still offers opportunity for a number of useful studies. These must be made with great care. Most particularly, great restraint is required in the necessary attempt to fill in by legitimate conjecture the blank spaces, both temporal and territorial, in which material is entirely lacking or else vague and insufficient. The best results will be obtained, I think, by highly specialized studies of single trades, carried where possible through the entire period of antiquity. As a model of what may be accomplished by an enthusiastic student of one particular craft and its products, Kisa's *Das Glas im Altertume* may be cited.¹

An opportunity to do a similar piece of work, equally interesting and of greater importance, perhaps, in the history of industrial development, is offered in the weaving trade. From Egypt we have great quantities of ancient fabrics, chiefly of coarse weaves. We have, especially from Egypt, a fairly large amount of information, both pictorial and documentary, upon the technique of the weaving industry. The basis for this phase of the work has already been laid in Blümner's *Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern*.² Other more special studies have also been made upon the ancient textile industries and the related dyeing industry. But there is no study of large scope which gives us a perspective of the advance in technical skill or the bearing of the Chinese silk trade upon the development of textile manufactures in the Mediterranean world. There is no satisfactory study of the changing social status of the weavers themselves throughout antiquity. In the period covered

¹ Dr. Anton Kisa, *Das Glas im Altertume* (Leipzig, 1908, 3 vols.).

² Hugo Blümner, *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern* (Leipzig, 1875-1887, 4 vols.).

by the papyri, inscriptions, and the codes of the Roman and Byzantine empires, roughly speaking from 300 B. C. to 900 A. D., information upon this subject is fairly abundant and easily accessible.

The comprehensive study of the weaving trade suggested above can only be undertaken by a scholar who is able to meet three requirements. He must have, or acquire, a knowledge of the technique of textile manufacturing. He must have time. He must have money available for travel and study in the great museums. The scholar best adapted for this service is, perhaps, to be found in a man of thorough classical training—the ancient languages are an absolute essential—connected with one of our best-equipped museums, in Boston, New York, or Chicago.

In the same way the lead industry of antiquity would also repay an intensive and comprehensive treatment, though not to the same degree as the weaving trade. Here, too, special studies are already available, but only as a working basis.³ As in the study of textile manufactures, the archaeological evidence would form the foundation of the work.

In the ancient iron industry more work has been done. The monumental work of Ludwig Beck upon the history of iron⁴ does not, however, make use of the epigraphical and papyrological evidence. Despite Waltzing's exhaustive volumes upon the industrial corporations among the Romans⁵ and other more recent studies on the Greek and Byzantine guilds, a separate study of the iron workers throughout antiquity would amply repay the time spent upon it as a dissertation. Here the ends to be sought are two: first, to determine the social classification of the laborers in the industry;⁶ second, to determine the amount of interest and control of the governments over ore production and manufacture in the iron industry.

For the ancient building trades, the archaeologists have already done a great deal in the study of the technique. But little attention has been given to their economic and social aspects; on this side

³ See the article *plumbum* in Daremberg-Saglio, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités Grecques et Romaines*. All the material available in the Greek papyri from Egypt has been gathered, for all the industries, by Th. Reil in his doctoral dissertation, *Beiträge zur Kenntniss des Gewerbes im Hellenistischen Aegypten* (Leipzig, 1913).

⁴ Dr. Ludwig Beck, *Die Geschichte des Eisens* (second ed., vol. I., Braunschweig, 1890-1891).

⁵ P. Waltzing, *Les Corporations Professionnelles chez les Romains* (Louvain, 1895-1900, 4 vols.).

⁶ A model for this type of study may be found in the article by H. Gummerus in *Klio*, XIV. 2, "Die Römische Industrie: das Goldschmied- und Juweliergewerbe".

of the building trades lies an untouched field. These subjects are suggested as types of investigation now greatly needed in the field of ancient history. It is only through such studies, and others like them, that we can attain a real knowledge of ancient industrial life.

W. L. WESTERMANN.

AMERICAN OPINION ON THE IMPERIAL REVIEW OF PROVINCIAL
LEGISLATION, 1776-1787

THERE has recently been published in the Columbia University *Studies* a monograph by Dr. E. B. Russell on *The Review of American Colonial Legislation by the King in Council*. In the closing chapter of his monograph, Dr. Russell lays some stress on the influence of this veto power as contributing "largely to the final breach between the colonies and the mother country". This view seems on the whole justified by the prominence given to the subject in the Declaration of Independence, where the enumeration of grievances against the British crown begins with the familiar indictment, "He has refused his assent to laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good", a charge which is followed up by a number of specifications in the succeeding paragraphs. It should be remembered, however, that in the earlier controversies, as well as in those of the Revolutionary era, the issue was not always clearly defined as between the imperial government on the one side and the whole body of colonists on the other. Sometimes, as for instance in the case of currency and "bank" legislation, a conservative minority in America was disposed to seek imperial protection against a radical majority. In other cases the royal veto was invoked to protect a colony against injurious legislation by one of its neighbors.

Generally speaking, the colonists did not question the legality of this prerogative and even so radical a person as Jefferson recognized its place in the constitution of the empire. His position was clearly set forth in 1774 in his "Summary View of the Rights of British America", where he describes the British Empire as a quasi-federal or personal union, having no authorized central legislature, in which the king was "as yet the only mediatory power between the several states".¹ An important part of this "mediatory power" was the royal veto. The actual exercise of that power the king had "for several ages past" "modestly declined" to continue "in that part of his Empire called Great Britain". The two houses of

¹ *Writings* (Ford ed.), I. 427 ff.; cf. Pownall, *Administration of the British Empire* (ed. 1777), I. 72 ff.